




STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Mike Flanagan 

**DATE:** August 8, 2006

**SUBJECT:** **APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR MICHIGAN'S ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ELPA)**

The purpose of this State Board of Education item is to present the tentative performance standards that were recommended for the new Michigan English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). The procedures used to set the performance standards were described in an information item in June, 2006. The procedures were carefully followed by the facilitators of the process, and were monitored by Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) staff to assure adherence to the plan. The results of the standard-setting activities are presented to the State Board of Education at this meeting since standard setting occurred July 10-12, 2006. The Michigan Technical Advisory Committee (comprised of nationally-recognized measurement and statistics experts), will review the procedures used and standard setting outcomes in late July, 2006. The results of that meeting will be presented at the August, 2006 State Board of Education meeting.

Performance standards were recommended on the ELPA for each grade from Kindergarten to twelfth grade. The recommended standards define the levels of performance for the statewide assessments used on the ELPA. These are Level *Basic*, *Low Intermediate*, *High Intermediate*, and *Proficient*.

Standard setting panels were organized by grade span (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). They were first asked to recommend standards for grades 2, 3, 8, and 9. After recommending those standards, the adjacent grade groups met together to assure that the standards recommended made sense within a complete assessment system. After that, the panelists were then asked to set standards for grades K, 5, 6, and 12; again assuring that the recommended standards made sense as a complete system. Finally, standards were recommended in grades, 1, 4, 7, 10, and 11 as a part of the complete system.

Standard setting was carried out by panels of educators and other Michigan stakeholders working under the direction of the contractors for ELPA and staff of the Department. Each panel spent three days reviewing the assessment instrument(s) assigned to them, individually judging the level of performance that students would need to achieve for each of the four performance levels for each

assessment, discussing these within their panel, and repeating this process up to three times, with additional performance information provided during each round.

Panelists made their final judgments individually, and the resulting recommendations are a compilation of these individual judgments. Panelists were then asked to indicate their confidence in the standards that they set and the processes used to set them. This summary information will also be presented when the results of standard setting are presented to the State Board of Education.

Attachment A provides a summary of the results of the ELPA standard setting process in terms of the recommended cut scores. Attachment B provides a summary of the panelists' evaluation of the ELPA process.

The result of this effort is that each panel recommends performance standards for each grade level. These recommended performance standards are presented to the State Board of Education for your discussion and approval.

**It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the performance standards that were recommended by the standard setting panels for the ELPA, and to use these performance standards in reporting the Spring 2006 ELPA results.**

### Results of the ELPA Standard Setting Process

The results presented to the State Board of Education are comprised of the recommended cut scores. Other information is available to answer any questions including the complete final standard setting plan and technical report.

The Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability, the Harcourt Assessment Inc. facilitators, and the Assessment & Evaluation Services facilitators carefully monitored the process to assure that the panelists were focused upon the Performance Level Descriptors, upon the items on the assessments, upon student work on the assessments, and that all other parts of the approved process were followed.

#### Recommended ELPA Raw Cut Scores

Grade	Low Intermediate	High Intermediate	Proficient	Anchor
K	31	42	49	Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form
1	43	54	68	Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form
2	47	60	74	Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form
3	32	52	71	Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form
4	34	55	73	Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form
5	38	58	75	Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form
6	37	61	76	Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form
7	39	65	78	Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form
<b>8</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form</b>
9	49	69	85	Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form
10	51	70	86	Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form
11	52	75	87	Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form
<b>12</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form</b>

### Panelist Evaluations of the ELPA Standard Setting Process

Indicate the level of success of various components of the standard-setting session in which you participated:

Panel Component	Not Effective	Partially Effective	Effective	Very Effective
K-2			5	3
			3	5
		1	2	5
				8
			1	7
			5	3
3-5			6	2
			3	3
		2	2	4
			3	5
		1	4	3
			3	5
6-8			3	5
			2	6
		1	1	6
			1	7
			2	6
				8
9-12			4	4
				6
			1	7
			3	5
		1	3	4
				8



**Please indicate the importance that you placed on the following factors in selecting your final round of ratings in the ordered item booklets**

Panel Component		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
K-2	Understanding of performance level descriptors		2	6
	Content of test items			8
	Information about the difficulty level of items		2	6
	Your own classroom experience		1	7
	Input from your committee discussions			8
	Input from the combined committee discussions		4	4
	Input from the facilitator	1	5	2
	Impact data		1	7
3-5	Understanding of performance level descriptors	1	4	3
	Content of test items		2	6
	Information about the difficulty level of items		4	4
	Your own classroom experience		2	6
	Input from your committee discussions		5	2
	Input from the combined committee discussions		2	5
	Input from the facilitator	3	4	1
	Impact data		1	3
6-8	Understanding of performance level descriptors		2	6
	Content of test items		2	6
	Information about the difficulty level of items	1	5	2
	Your own classroom experience		4	4
	Input from your committee discussions	1	2	5
	Input from the combined committee discussions	1	3	4
	Input from the facilitator		3	5
	Impact data		1	2
9-12	Understanding of performance level descriptors		3	5
	Content of test items			8
	Information about the difficulty level of items		3	5
	Your own classroom experience	1	2	4
	Input from your committee discussions		1	2
	Input from the combined committee discussions		3	3
	Input from the facilitator		2	2
	Impact data		2	1

Please indicate your level of confidence on the following questions.

Panel Component		Very Confident	Confident	Somewhat Confident	Not Confident
K-2	How confident are you in the placement of <i>your</i> final cut points?	6	2		
	How confident are you in the final cut points that were generated by your group as a whole?	2	2		
	How confident are you in the text of the performance level descriptors?	5	3		
	How confident are you that the Bookmark standard setting method has been an effective process for classifying student performance?	5	3		
3-5	How confident are you in the placement of <i>your</i> final cut points?	1	7		
	How confident are you in the final cut points that were generated by your group as a whole?	3	4	1	
	How confident are you in the text of the performance level descriptors?	3	3	2	
	How confident are you that the Bookmark standard setting method has been an effective process for classifying student performance?	1	4	3	
6-8	How confident are you in the placement of <i>your</i> final cut points?	5	3		
	How confident are you in the final cut points that were generated by your group as a whole?	7	1		
	How confident are you in the text of the performance level descriptors?	3	4	1	
	How confident are you that the Bookmark standard setting method has been an effective process for classifying student performance?	4	3	1	
9-12	How confident are you in the placement of <i>your</i> final cut points?	4	4		
	How confident are you in the final cut points that were generated by your group as a whole?	4	4		
	How confident are you in the text of the performance level descriptors?	2	4	2	
	How confident are you that the Bookmark standard setting method has been an effective process for classifying student performance?	4	4		